



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/804,745

03/19/2004

Robert A. Perisho JR.

DP-309408

7671

7590 05/29/2008
STEFAN V. CHMIELEWSKI
DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Staff MC CT10C
P.O. Box 9005
Kokomo, IN 46904-9005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TAN QUANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3661

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/804,745 | Applicant(s) PERISHO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner TAN Q. NGUYEN | Art Unit 3661 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-10 and 20-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 11-19, 39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAIL ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This office action is responsive to the Provisional Election filed on February 25, 2008. As per request, the applicant selected Group I, claims 1-7, 11-19, 29 and 40 with traverse. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-7, 11-19, 29 and 40 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that Group IV (claim 38) also includes measuring lateral acceleration and reducing vehicle speed, and should belong to group I also. This is not found persuasive because claim 38 recites the measuring lateral acceleration, estimating the radius of curvature of the vehicle, in which such limitation is not in Group I. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.
2. Thus, claims 1-40 are still pending. Claims 8-10 and 20-38 are withdrawn as to non-elected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sielagoski et al. (6,317,679) in view of Kawazoe (6,295,493).

6. With respect to claim 1, Sielagoski et al. disclose a method for controlling a vehicle having an adaptive cruise control system which includes the steps of determining when the vehicle is in a turn based on the yaw rate information (see at least column 1, line 45 to column 2, line 1), and reducing the vehicle speed according to the vehicle position in the turn (see at least column 2, lines 2-17). Sielagoski further disclose the relationship between the lateral acceleration and the radius of curvature as shown in figure 4.

7. Sielagoski et al. do not explicitly disclose that the determining when the vehicle is in a turn based on the detected changed in the vehicle's lateral acceleration. However, such relationship between the yaw rate and the lateral acceleration are taught by the Sielagoski et al. in at least figures 3 and 4 and the related text. Furthermore, the use of the change in lateral acceleration to determine when the vehicle is well known in the art at the time the invention was made and as shown in at least the paragraph 0058 of the Kato et al. reference or the column 9, lines 45-50 of the Kawazoe reference. It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine these teaching in order to determine when the vehicle is in a turn based on the change in the lateral acceleration and then reducing the vehicle speed while the vehicle is in the turn since the lateral information is well known sensed, detected and being used in the vehicle control art.

8. With respect to claim 2, Sielagoski et al. disclose the steps of measuring the vehicle's speed, yaw rate and the rate of change in the yaw rate (see at least figures 2, 5 and the related text).

9. With respect to claim 3, it is well known to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to know the relationship between the yaw rate, vehicle speed and the lateral acceleration. Thus, since Sielagoski et al. disclosed the use of vehicle speed sensor and the yaw rate sensor in figure 2, it would have been obvious that the lateral acceleration should be derived from the detected vehicle speed and yaw rate data.

10. With respect to claim 6, Sielagoski et al. also disclose the step of determining the vehicle's position within the turn as shown in at least column 1, lines 50-53.

11. With respect to claim 7, Sielagoski et al. disclose the step of reducing the vehicle speed until the vehicle lateral acceleration exceeds a predetermined limit (see at least figure 4 and the related text).

12. With respect to claim 39, it is obvious that the lateral acceleration can be calculated based on the yaw rate and vehicle speed or can be measured as shown in figure 5 of Kato et al.

13. Claims 11-19 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sielagoski et al. and Kawazoe as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Butsuen et al. (5,467,283).

14. With respect to claims 11 and 16-19, Sielogoski et al. and Kato et al. or Kawazoe disclose the claimed invention as discussed above except for the steps of detecting whether there is an object in the vehicle path during the turn and activating the brake if there is. However, such limitations are well known and taught by the Butsuen et al. in at least the abstract, figure 1, 5 and the related text. It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Butsuen in the combined system of Sielogoski et al. and Kato et al. or Kawazoe in order to improve the safety for the vehicle system during the turn by not only reducing the speed but also controlling the brake if there is an obstacle in the path of the turn. It is also obvious that if the obstacle is ignored if it is not in the path of travel.

15. With respect to claims 12-15 and 40, the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejections above. They are therefore considered rejected as set forth above.

16. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sielogoski et al. and Kawazoe as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Fukada et al. (5,627,756).

17. Sielogoski et al. and Kawazoe disclose the claimed invention as discussed above except for the steps of filtering the lateral acceleration data and processing the filtered lateral acceleration data. However, such teaching is old and well known in the art and as shown at least column 3, paragraphs 3, 4 and figures 5, 22, 24 and the related text of the Fukada et al. reference. It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate such teaching of Fukada et al. into the combined system of Sielogoski et al. and Kawazoe in order to have a smooth and needed data from the raw sensed data.

Remarks

18. Claims 1-7, 11-19, 39 and 40 are rejected.
19. Applicant's arguments filed on November 21, 2007 have been fully considered and they are partially deemed to be persuasive.
20. Applicant argued that Kato et al. does not disclose the detecting turn based on the change in the vehicle lateral acceleration is deemed to be persuasive. Also, the rejection for claim 11 missing the limitation of the detection of the object. However, the reference Kawazoe does suggest the turning from the change rate of the lateral acceleration as shown in at least column 9, lines 45-49, which is read on the claimed invention.
21. Upon the applicant's arguments and election, the new ground of rejection has been set forth as above.
22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Tan Q. Nguyen, whose telephone number is (571) 272-6966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 5:30 AM-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black, can be reached on (571) 272-6956.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to the Official Fax Center: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/804,745
Art Unit: 3661

Page 7

/tqn
May 31, 2008

/TAN Q. NGUYEN/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3661